

From: John Kumpf
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/12/01 12:21pm
Subject: microsoft case comments

A settlement in the Microsoft case is a contradiction.

Why?

Microsoft's corporate philosophy and business plan is maintaining its monopoly in Windows and leveraging that monopoly to succeed in other markets. It would never agree to a settlement agreement that prevented it from "including new features in their operating system," as they have said many times publicly. But such a settlement is exactly what's needed. The settlement must prevent future illegal monopolistic behavior.

Specifically, the Competitive Impact Statement (which i read at <http://www.usdoj.gov/atr/cases/f9500/9549.htm>) makes no mention of Microsoft's publicized attempts to leverage their monopoly in their .NET initiative and its centralized use of Microsoft's Passport service and MSN. These efforts are designed to further protect Microsoft's OS monopoly by preventing independent development of the market. Microsoft's efforts here are also intended to extend its monopoly to the internet. They are a widely recognized case of Microsoft's "Embrace, Extend, Extinguish," technique.

Jamie Love and Ralph Nader have a well thought-out web page on the issue which is fully support:
<http://www.essential.org/features/msfinalorder.html>

My comments are mine alone, and not representative of any other organization.

--

John Kumpf Alternate email:
john@kumpf.org jvkumpf@shr.intel.com
 john.kumpf@intel.com
 09.11.01

CC: jvkumpf@shr.intel.com@inetgw